

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 719

EA 012 215

AUTHOR Knopp, Robert; O'Reilly, Robert R.
TITLE Job Satisfaction of Teachers and Organizational Effectiveness of Elementary Schools.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 27p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Effective Teaching; Elementary Education; Foreign Countries; *Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Task Performance; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario (Ottawa)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction of teachers and perceived school effectiveness. Questionnaires were distributed to teachers in 75 elementary schools in Ontario, Canada. A job description index and the concept of organizational effectiveness were used to measure job satisfaction variables of work, promotion, pay, supervision, and coworkers. The findings suggest that perceived school effectiveness is related to satisfaction of teachers with coworkers, with supervision, and with the work itself. The results are discussed in light of the peculiarities of the educational setting and are linked to several themes in the literature related to motivation, satisfaction, and productivity. Two suggestions are offered at the end. To ensure high satisfaction with fellow teachers, and therefore school effectiveness, principals should display leadership behavior that will facilitate group development, support, and interaction. To ensure high teacher satisfaction with a principal's leadership approach, and therefore school effectiveness, school board officials should ensure that principals actually display such leadership behavior. (Author/LD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED177719

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JOB SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS
AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

ROBERT KNOOP
BROCK UNIVERSITY

ROBERT R. O'REILLY
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

RUNNING HEAD: JOB SATISFACTION

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. O'Reilly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 012 215

ABSTRACT

The relationship between the job satisfaction dimensions measured by the Job Description Index and organizational effectiveness as perceived by teachers was investigated in a sample of 75 elementary schools. The findings suggest that perceived school effectiveness is related to satisfaction of teachers with co-workers, with supervision and with the work itself. The results are discussed in light of the peculiarities of the educational setting and are linked to several themes in the literature related to motivation, satisfaction and productivity.

JOB SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS AND
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Research on the relationship between job satisfaction and performance is based on divergent positions. During the Human Relations era it was implicitly assumed that job satisfaction leads to performance. Extensive reviews by Brayfield and Crockett (1955), Vroom (1964), and Schwab and Cummings (1970) showed the relationship between the two variables to be only moderate, rather complex, and mediated by a variety of factors. Subsequent studies concentrated therefore on the conditions which influenced the relationship (Ewen, 1973; Wood, 1974; Inkson, 1978).

A second, more recent, position is that effective performance leads to job satisfaction (Lawler & Porter, 1967; Slocum, 1970; Lawler, 1973). Rewards derived from good performance are considered to be the intervening variable resulting in high job satisfaction. Empirical support for this position has been relatively strong but not abundant (Bowen & Siegel, Note 1; Greene, 1972).

March and Simon (1958) argued that both assumptions could be valid. Performance may result from a state of dissatisfaction if a person perceives that increased performance will satisfy his or her needs; or performance can increase satisfaction depending (a) on the interplay of actual and anticipated rewards, (b) on actual changes in expectations which may lead to desired performance patterns, and (c) on the influence of the work group. Subsequent research gave support to the argument that, based on the work environment and a worker's needs and values, either casual relationship could prevail (Porter & Lawler, 1968; Locke, 1970; Sheridan & Slocum, 1975; Steers, 1975).

A third position considers both satisfaction and performance to be functions of rewards (Cherrington, Reitz & Scott, 1971). Based on reinforcement theory, rewards cause satisfaction, and rewards based on current performance cause subsequent performance. According to this view there is no inherent casual relationship between satisfaction and performance. Greene's (1972) research supports this position.

The diversity of positions taken by researchers on the satisfaction-performance controversy leads one to conclude that no one overall theoretical framework exists which adequately explains how and why these two variables are or should be related. On the other hand, many of these models are appropriate

in certain circumstances. In reviewing content and process theories of job satisfaction, Locke (1976) has explored a variety of useful hypotheses. For example, Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory has led researchers to argue that outcomes are valued to the extent that they satisfy needs and that individuals will experience need satisfaction when they learn they have accomplished something (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). Need satisfaction is identified with motivation and, through motivation, with performance (Oldham, 1976).

While job satisfaction is commonly related to such terms as productivity or performance, it has been linked less frequently with organizational effectiveness. Problems in selecting the types of criteria indicating effectiveness and sources of the originators of the criteria have been cited as two of the reasons (Cameron, 1978); inadequacies and complexities of organizational effectiveness research generally as another reason (Goodman & Pennings, 1977).

The type of organization under investigation in this study, the elementary school, limits the argument of choice of universal criteria typifying effective organizations (Hall, 1972; Duncan, 1973; Scott, 1977). It is assumed that each school has similar characteristics, goals, and jobs to be performed. Because of this similarity and because of its

wide use (Price, 1972; Campbell, 1977), goal accomplishment was used as the criterion of effectiveness.

Since effectiveness criteria "always represents someone's values and biases" (Cameron, 1978, p. 606), reliance for criteria was placed upon official documents which provide guidelines for the conduct of schools (Ontario, 1968; Ontario, 1975), the results of a Canadian survey concerning the purposes of education (Lauwerys, 1973), and the results of surveys of school principals and other educators concerning the objectives of schools (Spears, 1973; Havighurst, Smith & Wilder, 1971). Thus the sources of the criteria are major decision makers of the organizations under study. This method is supported by several investigators (Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967; Price, 1968; Pennings & Goodman, 1977). For indices of actual effectiveness, reliance was placed upon the perceptions of those individual members of the organization who are directly involved in accomplishing school goals: the teachers. Support for this practice is given by Argyris (1962), Lawler, Hall and Oldham (1974), and others, who consider individual performance as the criterion for effectiveness, and by Campbell (1977) who preferred subjective perceptual criteria over objective criteria obtained from records, a method he labelled inappropriate.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationships between the job satisfaction of teachers and perceived school effectiveness. Given that organizational or school effectiveness is one variable under study, the appropriate unit of analysis is the school. Thus school effectiveness is the mean of the perceived effectiveness scores of all the teachers of the sample who teach in a particular school; the level of teacher satisfaction is similarly the mean school score of the teachers' expressed level of satisfaction.

Since the findings of earlier findings were inconclusive and often conflicting, due possibly to the inadequacies of the general theories relating job satisfaction to organizational effectiveness, an attempt was made to treat this issue, as it pertains to an educational environment, in an exploratory manner. It is suggested that the teaching profession provides a job setting which allows one to associate some, but not all, of the most frequently employed job satisfaction variables with school effectiveness.

It was decided to assess the five variables of job satisfaction measured by the Job Description Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). It measures the most widely known and the most clearly defined variables. Technically, the

scale is among the best available (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). The five variables are satisfaction with (1) work, (2) promotion, (3) pay, (4) supervision, and (5) co-workers.

Theoretical Framework

Given the lack of criteria for selecting any of the current models which link effectiveness with job satisfaction in a school setting, an appropriate mode of proceeding is to conduct an exploratory study which is based on some knowledge about the conduct of schooling and certain characteristics of an effective school. Thus, a first step is to examine the variables under consideration and consider, on an almost intuitive basis, how they may be related.

The first job satisfaction variable, satisfaction with the work itself, is expected to be related to school effectiveness. Teachers who find the work fascinating, challenging and creative are more likely to put more effort into their work than those who find it boring, useless and frustrating. The variable is much like Herzberg's (1959) motivator variable of "work itself". In Herzberg's view, satisfaction with the work itself is one of the most powerful motivators to work well. Examining the school situation, it

is seen that teachers have considerable control over their day-to-day activities of planning, teaching, interacting with pupils, and evaluating results. Although there are substantial bureaucratic superstructures for schools, teachers within the classroom have a great deal of freedom to act out idiosyncratic behavior in the conduct of their job (Lortie, 1969). Lortie suggests that teachers' major sources of satisfaction are psychic rewards and come from successes achieved with, and by, pupils (Lortie, 1969, p. 103). Thus satisfaction with the work itself is expected to be related to effectiveness.

The next job satisfaction variable, satisfaction with promotion, is not expected to be related to effectiveness. Promotion means moving away from teaching and most teachers do not aspire, in the short term at least, for promotion (Griffiths, Goldman & McFarland, 1965; Lortie, 1969, p. 8). This is not to say that some teachers do not keenly desire a promotion and will see superior teaching performance as a means to that promotion. Certainly a model of individual motivation would take this into account. Since it is assumed that only a minority of teachers are so motivated, there is no degree of association to be expected at the level of aggregated scores, that is at the school level of analysis.

The third variable, satisfaction with pay, is not hypothesized to be related to effectiveness. Even though the relationship between motivation and performance is expected to be greater when pay is contingent upon performance (Lawler, 1971, Hamner, 1974), such a positive relationship does not always occur (Jorgenson, Dunnette & Pritchard, 1973; Pritchard, DeLeo & Von Bergen, 1976). In education, teachers are generally paid according to wage scales which are similar within local jurisdictions. In Ontario, for instance, school managers have no authority to vary monetary rewards to teachers on the basis of performance. Level of satisfaction with pay is not expected to be related to teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness.

Both of the remaining two variables of the JDI, satisfaction with supervision and with co-workers, are expected to be related to school effectiveness. Satisfaction with supervision as a determinant of effectiveness is a fundamental tenet of Likert's (1968) theory. In an extensive review of the literature, Sales (1966) stated that the hypothesis that supervision with satisfaction is related to productivity is widely supported. In two separate studies of professionals, Mott (1972, p. 110) reported correlations of .34 and .42 between satisfaction with supervision and organizational effectiveness. It is to be expected that the more that

teachers experience supervision which meets their needs, the more successful will be the schools' programs.

There are two sets of reasons why satisfaction with co-workers is expected to relate to perceived school effectiveness. The first is that when teachers rate the school they in effect are rating the combined contributions of their peers to school effectiveness. The second set of reasons relate more to the task of teaching. Although teaching is a highly idiosyncratic activity undertaken in the largely isolated setting of the self-contained classroom, Lortie (1975, p. 193) notes "that teachers see each other as the primary source of useful ideas". Teachers, according to Lortie are sources of help to other teachers and serve as benchmarks for assessing one's own performance. In those schools where teachers rate their colleagues as stimulating, intelligent and responsible on the JDI, there is more likelihood of sharing of professional ideas and the promotion of improved teaching practices than would occur otherwise.

Method

Subjects

The population frame consisted of three urban Ontario school boards with a total of 136 elementary schools. Of these 75 schools (or 55%) were randomly selected as the units of this study.

The sample was comprised of every fifth teacher on the staff list of each school, except for smaller schools, in which case a minimum of three teachers were selected. In this way, 375 teachers were approached and 311 (or 83%) were included in the data-producing sample, an average of 4.15 teachers for each school and 22.1% of the teacher population. The other 64 teachers either refused to participate or filled out the questionnaires incompletely or improperly.

Instruments

Two instruments were used to collect data on the variables under investigation. Georgopoulos and Mann's (1962) measure of effectiveness, developed in a study of community general hospitals, was adopted to measure organizational effectiveness of schools.

Price (1972) claimed that Georgopoulos and Mann exercised "uncommon care in the evaluation of the validity and reliability of their measure" (p. 106), and Mott (1972) called their measures "a promising lead(...) in attempting to construct a valid subjective measure of organizational effectiveness" (p. 21).

Six goals were identified as stated goals by participants of the organization in various studies of school goals (Lauwerys, 1973; Ontario, 1968; Ontario, 1975;

Spears, 1973; Havighurst, Smith & Wilder, 1971):

1. Teaching generally (global measure)
2. Teaching of basic skills and knowledge
3. Teaching the ability to reason and apply knowledge
4. Teaching the ability to adapt to the changing world
5. Teaching the development of a student's potential as an individual
6. Teaching the ability to relate to and communicate with others.

The first goal, teaching, represents a measure of overall effectiveness; goals two to six are five specific goals of equal rank and weight. Teachers were asked to rate the degree of goal accomplishment on a seven-point scale ranging from outstanding to poor. In the questionnaire, teachers were instructed to think of the quality of teaching found in their school generally, and not only of their own teaching performance.

The Spearman-Brown odd-even estimate of reliability of the general effectiveness measure in this sample was .82.

The second instrument, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969), has been in wide use since its development. It breaks down satisfaction into five dimensions: work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers. The instrument was used because of its satisfactory convergent and discriminant validity (Smith, Smith & Rollo, 1974), because of its careful construction and general applicability (Vroom, 1964; Price, 1972), and because of its good stability coefficients

and relative independence of the five satisfaction scales over time (Schneider & Dachler, 1978).

Results

For this sample, all six effectiveness measures intercorrelate with each other significantly, generally with estimated r 's between .50 and .77 ($p < .001$). In contrast, the satisfaction variables tend to be more independent. Satisfaction with work correlates with satisfaction with promotion (.30), with supervision (.43) and with co-workers (.51) but not with pay. The only other significant correlation in the matrix is between supervision and co-workers (.45).

Table 1 about here

Table 1 displays the results. Correlations between the global effectiveness variable (how would you rate the quality of teaching that students generally receive from your school?) and each job satisfaction variable are similar to those between the total scores of all remaining specific effectiveness variables and job satisfaction. Generally, the predictions are upheld. In school settings, teachers perceive that students receive good instruction when they, as a group,

express satisfaction with the task of teaching itself, with their co-workers and with supervision.

Discussion

The data reflect some aspects of the profession of teaching. What Lortie (1969, 1975) calls extrinsic rewards (pay, promotion) are not emphasized within the teaching profession and are not used as rewards for successful performance. These rewards, particularly pay, are assigned to all teachers in a manner unrelated to their achievements. Since the correlations between these variables and effectiveness are not significant, one would have to doubt the reasonableness of the hypothesis of the human relations era which suggests that satisfaction leads to effective performance. One of the expectancy models of motivation, such as Vroom's (1964), would seem to hold more promise.

Lortie reviews a number of studies which show that the major source of all teacher satisfaction is intrinsic, that is, comes from the work of teaching children (Lortie, 1975, p. 103-107). This is supported by Holdaway's study of the satisfaction of Alberta teachers. Ninety-seven percent of his sample expressed satisfaction with their relationships with students (1978, Table 7, p. 56). If

teachers direct their energies where reward can be maximized, then they will channel effort into their work. This relationship also tends to support the expectancy model of motivation.

The leadership exercised in a school is important to teachers. Herzberg (1959) would identify it as a hygiene variable, that is poor supervision may make a subordinate dissatisfied, and possibly less productive, but that good supervision does not necessarily motivate. Nevertheless the principal does profoundly affect the working atmosphere of the school (Jackson, 1974). Since the teacher can do little to influence the leadership exercised by the principal, the correlation between school effectiveness and satisfaction with supervision is explained either by the association of these two variables with a third (unknown) variable, or more likely, effective supervision is a direct motivator for effective teaching.

Arguments similar to the above can be made about the findings related to satisfaction with co-workers. Herzberg also labels this as a hygiene variable (1959). However, the argument is made here that, among other roles played by teaching co-workers, co-workers can assist teachers to improve their teaching and can even stimulate them to do so. In this sense, satisfaction with colleagues can be a motivator of effective teaching.

However, as noted above, the two scores of satisfaction with co-workers, and school effectiveness may not be independent for another reason: the rating of school effectiveness to some extent includes assessing the effectiveness of the contributions of peers.

In terms of theory, the satisfaction-effectiveness link in the case of analyzing schools, remains vague. Seemingly, one can rule out the argument that satisfaction with extrinsic factors (Lortie, 1975) produces effectiveness. In terms of the major rewards available to teachers, only intrinsic rewards, as defined by Lortie (1975) in terms of the work of teaching itself appear to be related to effectiveness. The nature of the relationship is perhaps best explained by Vroom's expectancy model (Vroom, 1964). As to satisfaction with supervision and co-workers, their relationships with perceived effectiveness may be partially tautological, but may also be based on a cause-effect relationship where effective leadership and collegial support are exercised. These two satisfaction variables may be considered as indices that the organization is functioning well and as intervening variables between resources, management, and other in-puts and organizational products and outcomes (Likert, 1967).

These data suggest that a good school as measured by teacher perceptions of the quality of teaching received

by pupils, is characterized by a good principal and by good teachers most of whom derive a great deal of satisfaction from the task of teaching.

If viewed in this manner, the findings of this research suggest two guidelines for practitioners: (a) to ensure high satisfaction with fellow teachers, and therefore school effectiveness, principals should display leadership behavior which will facilitate staff group development, support, and interaction; (b) to ensure high teacher satisfaction with a principal's leadership approach, and therefore school effectiveness, school board officials should ensure that principals actually display such leadership behavior.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Bowen, D., & Siegel, J. The relationship between satisfaction and performance: The question of causality. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami Beach, September, 1970.

REFERENCES

- Argyrs, C. Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin, 1962.
- Brayfield, A., & Crockett, W. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 396-424.
- Cameron, K. Measuring organizational affectiveness in institutions of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1978, 23, 604-629.
- Campbell, J.P. On the nature of organizational effectiveness. In P.S. Goodman & J.M. Pennings (Eds.), New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Cherrington, D.J., Reitz, H.J., & Scott, W.E. Effects of contingent and non-contingent reward on the relationship between satisfaction and task performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 531-36.
- Duncan, R.B. Multiple decision-making structures in adapting to environmental uncertainty: the impact on organizational effectiveness. Human Relations, 1973, 26, 273-291.
- Ewen, R.B. Pressure for production, task difficulty, and the correlation between job satisfaction and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 378-380.
- Georgopoulos, B., & Mann, F. The community general hospital. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Goodman, P., & Pennings, J. (Eds.), New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Greene, C. The satisfaction-performance controversy. Business Horizons, 1972, 15, 31-41.
- Griffiths, D., Goldman, S., & McFarland, W. Teacher mobility in New York City. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1965, 1, 15-31.

- Hackman, R., & Lawler E. Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 259-286.
- Hall, R. Organizations: Structures and process. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-hall, 1972.
- Hamner, W. Reinforcement theory and contingency management in organizational settings. In H.L. Tosi & W.C. Hamner (Eds.), Organizational behaviour and management: A contingency approach. Chicago: St. Clair Press, 1974.
- Havighurst, R., Smith, F., & Wilder, D. A profile of the large city high school. The Bulletin of the NASSP, 1971, 55, (351), 3-104.
- Herzberg, F. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Holdaway, E.A. Teacher satisfaction: An Alberta report. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1978.
- Inkson, K.J. Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 243-247.
- Jackson, G.B. Executive professional leadership and organizational health. Canadian Administrator, 1974, 13, 23-27.
- Jorgenson, D.C., Dunnette, M.D., & Pritchard, R.D. Effects of the manipulation of a performance-reward contingency on behaviour in a simulated work setting. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1973, 57, 271-280.
- Lauwerys, J. The Purpose of education: Results of a CEA survey. Toronto: Canadian Educational Association, 1973.
- Lawler, E.E. Pay and organizational effectiveness: a psychological view. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Lawler, E.E. Motivation in work organizations. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1973.

- Lawler, E.E., Hall, D.F., & Oldham, G.R. Organizational climate: relationship to organizational structure, process, and performance. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 1974, 11, 139-155.
- Lawler, E.E., & Porter, W. The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Industrial Relations, A Journal of Economy and Society, 1967, 1, 20-28.
- Likert, R. The Human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Locke, E.A. Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 1970, 5, 484-500.
- Locke, E.A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
- Lortie, D.C. The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In Amitai Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers. New York: Free Press, 1959.
- Lortie, D.C. School-teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. Organizations New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Mott, P.E. The characteristics of effective organizations. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Oldham, G.R. Job Characteristics and internal motivation: the moderating effect of interpersonal and individual variables. Human Relations, 29, 1976, 559-569.
- Ontario. Report of the provincial committee on aims and objectives of education in the schools of Ontario (Living and Learning). Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1968.
- Ontario. Circular P.J.1: The formative years. Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1975.

- Pennings, J.M., & Goodman, P.S. Toward a workable framework. In P.S. Goodman & J.A. Pennings (Eds.), New Perspective on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press, 1968.
- Price, J.L. Organizational effectiveness: An inventory or propositions. Homewood, Ill: Irwin, 1968.
- Price, J.L. Handbook of organizational measurement. Lexington: Heath & Co., 1972.
- Pritchard, R.D., DeLeo, P.L., & Von Bergen, C.W. A field experimental test of expectancy-valence incentive motivation techniques. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance. 1976, 15, 355-406.
- Sales, S.M. Supervisory style and productivity: Review and theory. Personnel Psychology, 1966, 19, 275-294.
- Schneider, B., & Dadelor, H.P. A note on the stability of the job description index. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 650-653.
- Schwab, D., & Cummings, L. Theories of performance and satisfaction: a review. Industrial Relations, 1970, 9, 408-430.
- Scott, W.R. Effectiveness of organizational effectiveness studies. In P.S. Goodman & J.M. Pennings (Eds.) New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Sheridan, J.E., & Slocum, J.W. The direction of the casual relationship between job satisfaction and work performance. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 1975, 14, 159-172.
- Slocum, J.W. Performance and satisfaction: An analysis. Industrial Relations, 1970, 9, 431-436.
- Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Smith, P., Smith, O., & Rollo, J. Factor structure for Blacks and Whites of the Job Description Index and its Discrimination of Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 99-100.

- Spears, H. Kappans ponder the goals of education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 55, 29-32.
- Steers, R.M. Problems in measurement of organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1975, 20, 546-558.
- Trask, A.E. Principals, teachers and supervision: Dilemmas and solutions. Administrator's Notebook, 1964, 13, 1-4.
- Vroom, V.H. Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Wood, D.A. Effect of work orientation differences on job attitude correlates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 54-60.
- Yuchtman, E., & Seashore, S.E. A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 891-903.

FOOTNOTES

Robert Knoop is Associate Professor of educational administration, Faculty of Education, Brock University, St. Catherine's, Ontario, L2S 3A1, and Robert R. O'Reilly is Associate Professor, Graduate Section, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 6N5.

TABLE 1

Correlation Between Satisfaction Variables and General
and Total Effectiveness Scores Together with Means and
Standard Deviations N=75

Satisfaction with	Teaching Generally	All Specific Goals	M.	SD
Work	.27*	.27*	38.03	3.5
Pay	.06	.15	13.68	3.3
Promotion	-.02	.07	5.71	2.6
Supervision	.36**	.31**	43.74	7.1
Co-workers	.46**	.42**	43.78	5.8
M	5.18	4.74		
SD	.50	.50		

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$